

February 26, 1976

be spent this year, is that correct?

SENATOR CLARK: I'm sure that there is.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: You recommend this as a precedent that we turn back all of those funds that will not be spent this year?

SENATOR CLARK: Of course not because they are obligated funds. If these were obligated for that purpose to be spent I certainly would not want to withdraw them either.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: I believe that last Special Session when we were talking about funds, we talked about a two million dollar appropriation in NRD funds, water funds, is that right?

SENATOR CLARK: On what?

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Wasn't there a two million dollar fund there that we started to eliminate because it....was not going to be spent during this year? It dealt with water. I'm sorry I did not have time to do all of my research, this came up very quickly and I am relying on memory.

SENATOR CLARK: I really don't know.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Now, in terms of these idle funds, could I ask this. If they are appropriated and we don't use them, are they invested?

SENATOR CLARK: They are invested, yes.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: So, they are not really idle funds in terms of the state losing money.

SENATOR CLARK: They are not idle from the standpoint of interest, no. But they are tied up and can be spent for nothing else.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Then let me make, thank you Senator Clark. Let me make a couple of remarks. I too am concerned in terms of the Papio Water Shed Project. I ask in terms of the re-evaluation that they are doing now on my county board and my county did not support a re-evaluation. I support them in that position. There has been a call by some for re-evaluation including the Chief Executive. I have checked with him just yesterday and talked to him about an article that appeared in the paper, not with him, I want to make that clear. I talked with his staff. They said at no point in time had I ever gave the impression that I was not in favor of the recreational funds for this program. I think that the issue now is, and I understand why this is being done. It is being done because it takes it out and we no longer authorize this. Then the burden of responsibility is to put it back. This is not simply a financial manipulation and I know it. I am clever enough to know that and those of you sitting on this floor are clever enough to know that. The two million dollars in terms of other expenditures, first of all, I don't want to review our budgetary past, and the soundness of our fiscal policy. The two million dollars could serve a number of purposes even if